

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-19, 21-22, and 24-25 have been amended. Claims 3, 17, and 23 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-22, and 24-26 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Everdell et al (U.S. Publication 2002/0165961, hereinafter “Everdell”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 1, Everdell fails to disclose a first node of a distributed store comprising a primary state of session data configured for access by a plurality of application servers, wherein the session data provides state information for each of a plurality of sessions, wherein each session involves a plurality of application level interactions between a client and one or more of the plurality of application servers, wherein for each session the session data indicates the state of the application level interactions between the client and the one or more application servers for that session, and wherein the session data comprises a current version of a plurality of attributes, as recited in amended claim 1.

Everdell’s method and system provides control of network resource allocations of multiple devices. More specifically, Everdell teaches methods for providing sufficient bandwidth to the devices to prevent starvation during high-traffic conditions as well as during single or multiple device failures across the network. The Examiner has cited paragraphs [0125] and [0121] of Everett; however, these paragraphs do not disclose the limitations of amended claim 1 recited above. For example, paragraph [0121] discloses that network manager systems (NMS) “are used to configure and manage multiple heterogeneous and/or homogeneous network devices”. The NMS may be used to configure and manage devices on a network. Applicants assert that one skilled in the art

would readily understand that the NMS is not *a first node of a distributed store comprising a primary state of session data configured for access by a plurality of application servers, wherein the session data provides state information for each of a plurality of sessions, wherein each session involves a plurality of application level interactions between a client and one or more of the plurality of application servers, wherein for each session the session data indicates the state of the application level interactions between the client and the one or more application servers for that session, and wherein the session data comprises a current version of a plurality of attributes*, as recited in amended claim 1. Managing a network, as disclosed in Everdell, does not disclose or anticipate these limitations as recited in amended claim 1. Regarding paragraph [0125], Applicants note that Everdell teaches two configuration databases: a configuration relationship database and an NMS relationship database, which may be used to change various aspects of the configuration of the network. While Everdell does disclose a database for storing configuration information of a network system, Applicants assert that Everdell nowhere discloses anything like a primary state of session data as recited in amended claim 1. One skilled in the art understands that configuration information of a network is not a primary state of session data as recited in amended claim 1.

In further regard to claim 1, Everdell fails to disclose another node comprising a back-up instance of the primary state, wherein the back-up instance of the primary state comprises a back-up version of the plurality of attributes in the session data of the primary state, as recited in amended claim 1. As argued above, Everdell fails to teach a first node of a distributed store comprising a primary state of session data as recited in amended claim 1. Correspondingly, Everdell cannot teach another node comprising a back-up instance of the primary state of the session data. Thus, for at least the reasons above, Everdell fails to disclose this feature of claim 1.

In further regard to claim 1, Everdell fails to disclose wherein the system is configured to compare the primary state to a benchmark version of the primary state to determine one or more of the attributes of the session data that have been modified in the

current version of the plurality of attributes in the primary state, wherein the benchmark version of the primary state comprises a previous version of the plurality of attributes in the session data of the primary state, as recited in amended claim 1. Everdell teaches that the NMS server keeps track of important statistics such as which devices are the “heavy talkers” in the network, and that using these statistics, the network administrator may “determine when it is time to grow the management system by adding another server”. However, Applicants assert that these statistics, and actions which a user can perform after examining them, do not anticipate the above limitations as recited in claim 1.

In further regard to claim 1, Everdell fails to disclose wherein the system is configured to synchronize the back-up version of the plurality of attributes in the back-up instance of the primary state on the other node with the current version of the plurality of attributes in the primary state. As argued above, Everdell fails to teach *a primary state of session data, a back-up instance of the primary state, and comparing the primary state to a benchmark version of the primary state to determine one or more of the attributes of the session data that have been modified in the current version of the plurality of attributes in the primary state* as recited in the amended claim 1, nor does Everett teach *sending the determined one or more of the attributes of the session data that have been modified to the other node as modified attributes of the session data, wherein unmodified attributes of the session data are not sent to the other node*. Correspondingly, Everdell cannot teach this feature of claim 1.

In further regard to claim 1, Everdell fails to disclose that said synchronizing comprises sending the determined one or more of the attributes of the session data that have been modified to the other node as modified attributes of the session data, wherein unmodified attributes of the session data are not sent to the other node, and updating respective attributes in the plurality of attributes in the back-up instance of the primary state according to the modified attributes, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. For at least the reasons

presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks as those above regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 7, 11, 15 and 21.

Applicants also assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-12100/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 21, 2009